

Michael O. Leavitt Governor Kathleen Clarke Executive Director Lowell P. Braxton

Division Director

State of Utah DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES DIVISION OF OIL, GAS AND MINING

1594 West North Temple, Suite 1210 PO Box 145801 Salt Lake City, Utah 84114-5801 801-538-5340 801-359-3940 (Fax) 801-538-7223 (TDD)

November 5, 1999

CERTIFIED RETURN RECEIPT Z 230 748 167

Gary Gray, Resident Agent Genwal Resources, Inc. P.O. Box 1420 Huntington, Utah 84528

Re: <u>Proposed Assessment for State Violation No. N99-39-3-1, Genwal Resources, Inc.,</u>

Crandall Canyon Mine, ACT/015/032, Folder #5, Emery County, Utah

Dear Mr. Gray:

The undersigned has been appointed by the Division of Oil, Gas & Mining as the Assessment Officer for assessing penalties under R645-401.

Enclosed is the proposed civil penalty assessment for the above referenced violation. The violation was issued by Division Inspector Steve Demczak on October 29, 1999. Rule R645-401-600 et. seq. has been utilized to formulate the proposed penalty. By these rules, any written information which was submitted by your or your agent within fifteen (15) days of receipt of the Notice of Violation has been considered in determining the facts surrounding the violation and the amount of penalty.

Under R645-401-700, there are two informal appeal options available to you:

- 1. If you wish to informally appeal the <u>fact of violation</u>, you should file a written request for an Informal Conference within 30 days of receipt of this letter. This conference will be conducted by the Division Director. This Informal Conference is distinct from the Assessment Conference regarding the proposed penalty.
- 2. If you wish to review the proposed penalty assessment, you should file a written request for an Assessment Conference within 30 days of receipt of this letter. If you are also requesting a review of the fact of violation, as noted in paragraph 1, the Assessment Conference will be scheduled immediately following that review.

4600

N99-39-3-1 ACT/015/032 November 5, 1999 Page 2

If a timely request for review is not made, the fact of violation will stand, the proposed penalty(ies) will become final, and the penalty(ies) will be due and payable within thirty (30) days of the proposed assessment. Please remit payment to the Division, mail c/o Tiffini Moss.

Sincerely,

Pamela Grubaugh-Littig

Assessment Officer

tm Enclosure

cc: James Fulton, OSM

O:\015032.CRA\ASSESMNT\N9939-3-1ltr.wpd

SENDER: Complete items 1 and/or 2 for additional serve Complete items 3, 4a, and 4b. Print your name and address on the reverse card to you. Attach this form to the front of the mailpiece, permit. Write "Return Receipt Requested" on the mail "The Return Receipt will show to whom the ard delivered.	following services (for an extra fee): 1. Addressee's Address be below the article number. Addressee's Address 2. Restricted Delivery	
3. Article Addressed to: GARY GRAY GENWAL RESOURCES PO BOX 1420 HUNTINGTON UT 8452	4a. Article Number Z 230 748 167 4b. Service Type Registered Express Mail Return Receipt for Merchandise COD 7. Date of Delivery	
5. Received By: (Print Name) 6. Signature: (Addressee or Agent) X	and fee is paid)	

UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE

Print your name, address, and ZIP Code in this box

DIVISION

OF

OIL GAS & MINING

DIV. OF OIL, GAS & WINNORTH TEMPLE STE 1210

BOX 145801

SALT LAKE CITY UT 84114-5801

TM DOGM ACT/015/032 11/10/99 #5

WORKSHEET FOR ASSESSMENT OF PENALTIES DIVISION OF OIL, GAS & MINING

COMF	'ANY/	MINE	Genwal Resource	s/ Crandall Canyon Mine	NOV #	N99-39-3-1	
PERM	IT <u>A</u>	CT/015/	<u>′032</u>	V	IOLATION _	<u>1</u> of <u>1</u>	
ASSES	SSMEN	NT DAT	E <u>11/05/99</u>	ASSESSMENT OFFICER	Pamela Grub	augh-Littig	
I.	HIST	ORY	(Max. 25 pts.)				
A. Are there previous violations, which are not pending or vacated, whi (1) year of today's date?							
	PREV	'IOUS V	/IOLATIONS	EFFECTIVE DATE	POINTS		
	N	98-39-6-	-1	11/24/98	1		
II.	CEDI	OLIGNIE	5 points for each j No pending notice			INTS <u>1</u>	
11.			ESS (Either A or)		C 11	1	
	NOTE	±:	For assignment of	f points in Parts II and III, the	tollowing app	ly:	
1. Based on facts supplied by the determine within each category						icer will	
ac			Beginning at the mid-point of the category, the Assessment Officer will adjust the points up or down, utilizing the inspector's and operator's statements as guiding documents.				
		Is this	an EVENT (A) or	HINDRANCE (B) violation	? <u>Hindrance</u>	_	
	A.	EVE	NT VIOLATION	(Max 45 pts.)			
		1.	What is the event	which the violated standard	was designed to	prevent?	

2. What is the probability of the occurrence of the event which a violated standard was designed to prevent?

<u>PROBABILITY</u>	<u>RANGE</u>					
None	0					
Unlikely	1-9					
Likely	10-19					
Occurred	20					
ASSIGN PROBABILITY OF OCCURRENCE POINTS						

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS:

3. What is the extent of actual or potential damage?

RANGE 0-25

In assigning points, consider the duration and extent of said damage or impact, in terms of area and impact on the public or environment.

ASSIGN DAMAGE POINTS ____

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS:

- B. <u>HINDRANCE VIOLATION</u> (Max 25 pts.)

Assign points based on the extent to which enforcement is actually or potentially hindered by the violation.

ASSIGN HINDRANCE POINTS ___5_

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS:

The lack of information included in the water quality submittal could be a potential water quality problem, but it is unknown.

- III. <u>NEGLIGENCE</u> (Max 30 pts.)
 - A. Was this an inadvertent violation which was unavoidable by the exercise of reasonable care? IF SO--NO NEGLIGENCE: or was this a failure of a permittee to prevent the occurrence of a violation due to indifference lack of diligence, or lack of reasonable care, or the failure to abate any violation due to the same? IF SO--GREATER DEGREE OF FAULT THAN NEGLIGENCE.

No Negligence 0 Negligence 1-15 Greater Degree of Fault 16-30

STATE DEGREE OF NEGLIGENCE Negligent

ASSIGN NEGLIGENCE POINTS 13

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS:

The permittee did not review the documents prior to submitting them to the Division (submitted by consultant). A hindrance violation was issued on November 24, 1998 for failure to have water quality samples.

IV. GOOD FAITH (Max 20 pts.)

(Either A or B)

(Does not apply to violations requiring no abatement measures)

A. Did the operator have onsite, the resources necessary to achieve compliance of the violated standard within the permit area?

IF SO--EASY ABATEMENT

Easy Abatement Situation

Immediate Compliance

-11 to -20*

(Immediately following the issuance of the NOV)

Rapid Compliance

-1 to -10

(Permittee used diligence to abate the violation)

Normal Compliance

(Operator complied within the abatement period required) (Operator complied with condition and/or terms of approved Mining and Reclamation Plan)

- * Assign in upper of lower half of range depending on abatement occurring the 1st or 2nd half of abatement period.
- B. Did the permittee not have the resources at hand to achieve compliance, or does the situation require the submission of plans prior to physical activity to achieve compliance?

IF SO--DIFFICULT ABATEMENT

Difficult Abatement Situation

Rapid Compliance

-11 to -20*

(Permittee used diligence to abate the violation)

Normal Compliance

-1 to -10*

(Operator complied within the abatement period required)

Extended Compliance

0

(Permittee took minimal actions for abatement to stay within the limits of the NOV or the violated standard of the plan submitted for abatement was incomplete) (Permittee complied with conditions and/or terms of approved Mining and Reclamation Plan)

EASY OR DIFFICULT ABATEMENT? N/A

ASSIGN GOOD FAITH POINTS 0

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS:

V. <u>ASSESSMENT SUMMARY</u>

NOT	ICE OF VIOLATION N99-39-3-1	
I.	TOTAL HISTORY POINTS	1
II.	TOTAL SERIOUSNESS POINTS	3
III.	TOTAL NEGLIGENCE POINTS	13
IV.	TOTAL GOOD FAITH POINTS	0
	TOTAL ASSESSED POINTS	<u> 17</u>
	TOTAL ASSESSED FINE	\$170.00

O:\015032.CRA\ASSESMNT\N9939-3-1wks.wpd